

Special Building Committee Meeting
March 20, 2017

The Special Building Committee Meeting was called to order by Robert Keeney on Monday, March 20, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. in Room 266 of the Administration Building, 111 S. Jefferson Street, Lancaster, WI.

Open Meeting Certification: Linda K. Gebhard confirmed the agenda was posted in the Administration Building, Courthouse and posted on the County Web Site.

Members present: Dan Timmerman, Dale Hood, John Patcle, Gary Ranum and Robert Keeney. Department Heads present: Joyce Roling, Personnel Director, Nancy Scott, Finance Director, Jack Johnson, Chief Deputy Sheriff, Fred Naatz, Lori Reid, Dave Timmerman, David Bainbridge, Ben Wood, Corporation Counsel and Steve Braun.

Discussion on Construction Management Services for Proposed Facility: The County is at the stage to hire a Construction Manager for the proposed building project of the Law Enforcement/Jail/Social Services and ADRC. Chair Robert Keeney explained to the committee in going through the proposal sent to him from Kurt Berner, The Samuel's Group, he requested some of the costs stated in Division 1. Chair Robert Keeney stated he had been contacted by EPIC to inquire if they could present their information to the committee. Robert felt this would be a good time for the committee to hear from another construction firms to see what they could offer the County in regard to a Manager.

Robert introduced Brad Bierman, Epic Construction. Brad explained what EPIC could supply to the County in that role. Brad would hold the role as the Construction Manager setting the schedule, overseeing the construction process; conduct the bidding contractor process, acting as the liaison between the Construction Engineer and County. Many of EPIC staff lives in the area which would be a plus for the County. Brad did not come before the committee with a formal quote from EPIC at this time; he wanted to open the discussion for question. Using the quote The Samuel's Group sent to the County as an outline; Brad went through what EPIC costs would be relating to the construction contract and what the line items would entail for the County. Being a local company they could illuminate some of the costs relating to The Samuels Group would have. Some of the costs in The Samuels' Group are figured on an hourly rate, Brad explained EPIC would go more with a flat fee scale. Brad explained in his opinion a building is a building and he felt EPIC would be totally capable of building a project such as what the County is discussing. Brad told the committee he would charge on a general fee which would include all the running costs such as fencing, portable toilets, etc. which the County would only pay the invoiced fee on items such as these with no mark up on those items. They do self-perform; participating in the bidding process to take on some of the construction duties along with being the Construction Manager. Brad hoped that during the construction process EPIC would still be able to enter into that process also.

Brad stated he would have to study the project prints in more detail in order to give the committee an accurate quote he did not have time to really study all the information. In a conversation with Robert Keeney, Brad felt EPIC could come in at \$750,000.00 including their

Superintendent and Project Manager Fees verses the 1.3 million stated by The Samuel's Group. Division 1 through EPIC would be handled as reimbursable items.

Gary Ranum stated he had looked at some construction cost inflation numbers and according to his estimate using the formulas supplied he felt the Law Enforcement/Jail Project, not counting Social Services and ADRC should be at \$13 million. But the numbers that have been submitted to the county have been significantly higher. Brad was asked where he felt the construction market is at this time. Brad felt the last few years' construction has been fairly flat; it is starting to rebound now. He stated the cost of steel has been rising currently. He saw no challenges in regard to the site were the County is looking to build so he saw now surprises that should be reflected in the costs. Brad could not speak to the mechanical and electrical components until he could study the plans more closely on the cost of materials. Brad stated they would want the estimate as realistic as possible; that would be to base the cost on the square footage of the structure.

At 1:25 p.m., Chair Robert Keeney contacted Kurt Berner, The Samuel's Group by phone to let him way in on the information that had been shared at the committee.

The committee asked Kurt to clarify the Division 1 costs in The Samuel's Group proposal that were in question. He stated those were the General Conditions; they are an allowance at this point for each area. These costs include staff onsite and offsite, building permits, all items used during construction for temporary use such as portable toilets, construction fencing, etc.

The duration of the contract is for 18 months of construction on one campus. Kurt stated his company is willing to negotiate on such things as staff lodging, scheduling for safety director and the field engineer are two typical areas that can be negotiated to help cut costs. The Superintendent will be on site at all times, Project Manager will be on site some days and in the home office on other days. Kurt stated the Safety Director for his company must be on site at least one day per week to inspect and take care of any issues on the project; that is not negotiable.

Kurt explained the estimates were handled separately. As each component was defined they were able to fine tune the estimates. They involved electrical engineers, masonry, mechanical, security contractors, etc. who looked at the project and submitted budgets in today market, that is what The Samuel's Group pulled their numbers from.

Dan Timmerman asked what the difference between the Site Superintendent, Field Engineer and the Project Manager. Project Superintendent is a person who has actually worked in the trades. Site Superintendent has the on-site knowledge and puts the schedule together and coordinates the work schedule, reviews safety plan, this person holds all parties accountable holding on going meetings to discuss all components of the project. They deal with any disputes on the construction site. Project Manager is the paper work guy working with the estimating team going over the contracts, acquisitions, insurance requirements and handles change order requests to evaluation and quantify. Field Engineer is an extension of the Project Manager on site, handling more of the computer work. They would handle the onsite software programs usually on the bigger projects they like to have this person involved.

Robert asked if there were any comments that anyone would like to make at this time. Kurt stated he was a little surprised and frustrated that at this point the county was looking into alternative Construction Managers. The Samuel's Group has been in the process since the beginning and all seemed to be on the same page throughout the process. Robert Keeney stated the county understands the position of the Samuel's Group but where there was such a difference in cost for the reimbursable items the County has to look at local companies and cost cutting options in the best interest for the County.

Brad Bierman questioned the need for a Field Engineer and a Safety Consultant. EPIC would have a Structural Engineer involved in the project who would be more qualified than a Field Engineer. He feels the Safety Director should not be tied to the company but should be a Safety Consultant provided by the Insurance carrier. Also questioning some of the temporary construction items such as fencing, dumpster use, and cost of permits that seemed to be over-estimated. Brad knows EPIC has not constructed as many correctional facilities as the Samuel's Group but he has confidence EPIC can complete a quality project for the County at a much lower cost. Brad stated he did not anticipate many changes in the scope being a brand new building; changes would be more prevalent if this was a remodel.

Gary Ranum asked if the County should consider hiring a General Contractor along with a Project Manager. Brad stated that is highly unusual. There would be a better working relationship with all the construction partners that will enter into a large project like this in only dealing with one person and there is an advantage in having local contractors involved. That would also be an added fee that would be un-necessary. The trend in construction is hiring a Construction Manager verses a General Contractor. The County would hire a Construction Manager for a flat fee, there would be no hidden fees for them to conduct the bidding process, they in turn works with the Construction Engineer and both work the County, that is the team.

Dan Timmerman asked if EPIC would be submitting closed bids for certain aspects of the project would that be a problem or conflict of interest. Typically this can happen. EPIC would submit a closed bid that would be opened with all other closed bids so there would be no advantage because they are the Project Manager. EPIC would still be obligated to achieve the best numbers for the County because that is what they are hired for.

Robert Keeney asked Brad to put an estimate together from EPIC and deliver it to the County the next morning prior to the full County Board of Supervisor meeting so it can be discussed. No action or recommendation needs to be given; this committee is for information only. Gary Ranum stated that in order for any decisions to come into play a definite cost needs to be defined. The committee asked if EPIC could be ready to go out for bids in May as scheduled. Brad Bierman stated that if Potter and Lawson were ready to go forward with the project he felt that time line originally set could be achieved.

Possible uses of Third Floor of Administration Building: This item was included on the agenda for discussion because of an email Robert Keeney sent to Kevin Anderson, Eric Lawson, Kurt Berner, and all the department heads involved in this project. Lynda Schweikert was also included because there will have to be a rezone done on part the property involved in the new building site at Orchard Manor due to the office space that will be included in the plan. And

also if funds can be saved the canopy will be added back onto the project that was taken off to save money. There is also a concern that added towers, possibly on the Lippert property, will have to be discussed for the new facility. There are some programs that work out of the Social Services area that have not been included in the new facility. The Holiday Project now housed in the 52 Building with Social Services has been discussed. Platteville Family Recourse Center, Alzheimer's/Dementia Alliance work out of the 52 Building; they work more with Orchard Manor and there is some general storage rooms used in the 52 Building. Fred Naatz stated that the difficult part of separating these organizations if the financial aspect, they would have to become independent and function on their own.

Robert Keeney stated these are concerns that he wanted the committee to think about for further discussion in the future. There will be two years before the new facility would be ready to move into; Robert wanted these issues brought up for the committee's future input. If the third floor of the Administration Building could be utilized the possibilities should be thought about.

Adjournment: Robert Keeney adjourned the meeting to the call of the chair.